



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## OCTOBER MEETING, 1906.

THE stated meeting was held on Thursday, the 11th instant, at three o'clock, P. M. In the absence of the President, who had not reached home from a summer trip to Norway in time to be present, the senior Vice-President, Hon. SAMUEL A. GREEN, was in the chair. The record of the June meeting was read and approved; and the Corresponding Secretary and the Librarian submitted their monthly reports. The Cabinet-Keeper referred to the work which Mr. William Sumner Appleton was kindly doing in arranging the collection of coins and medals bequeathed by his father, and read the following extracts from a letter from him, dated September 21, 1906:

"I write to let you know the outcome of my meeting this summer with Mr. Charles Steigerwalt, of Lancaster, Pennsylvania, who very kindly put in a day's work on the Society's collection without cost. I was under the impression that there were many duplicates in the regular series. This turns out not to be the case, for these extra pieces all represent the separate mintages.

"Excepting for the absence of the gold series, the collection as a whole seems to Mr. Steigerwalt about as complete as any of which he has knowledge. In the colonial coins and tokens line he considers the collection unexcelled, and, very possibly, unequalled. The question of the extension of the collection is one which considerably interests me, and I hope you will excuse my mentioning it. The collection is not quite complete as it stands. There are some half-dozen or dozen pieces which should be added (exclusive of the gold), and the latest issues of the regular series and the latest medals. When these are supplied, it should be a comparatively simple matter to keep the collection always up to the mark, always complete. The cost involved should not exceed a very few hundred dollars a year at the most. If the Society can by any chance make such an annual appropriation, I should think it a very wise step to take. Of course I understand perfectly that such later purchases would form no part of the Appleton Collection, but that is a minor matter. The vital thing is that there should be somewhere in Boston a perfect collection of American coins and medals, and it certainly seems as though the Massachusetts Historical Society were the proper custodians of such a collection.

"I was interested to find that Mr. Steigerwalt agreed with Mr. Sylvester S. Crosby's remark made to me, that a combination of the American collections of the late Mr. Stickney (Salem) and Dr. Hall (Boston) with my father's, would make a collection which no expenditure of time, money, or brains could ever equal."

The VICE-PRESIDENT said : —

At the last meeting of the Society in June, just before the usual summer vacation, the list of our resident membership was full, containing an even hundred names. During this period of four months two of the members have died: the Rev. Edward J. Young, D.D., at Waltham, on June 23; and the Rev. Edmund F. Slafter, D.D., at Little Boar's Head in the town of North Hampton, New Hampshire, on September 22.

Dr. Young was chosen a member on June 13, 1878; and for nearly twenty-three years he was the Recording Secretary of the Society, a longer term than has fallen to the lot of any other person who has filled the office. Owing to ill health, he was obliged, at the beginning of the year, to resign this position.

Dr. Slafter was chosen a member, on October 13, 1881, and had served on the Council of the Society for one term of two years. At the time of his death he had reached the venerable age of ninety, and was one of the few nonagenarians ever included in the list of Resident Members.

Agreeably to long usage on such occasions, a tribute will be paid to the memory of Dr. Young by Mr. Smith, and one to the worth of Dr. Slafter by Mr. Haynes.

It will be remembered that at the last meeting a Committee were appointed, consisting of Messrs. Brooks Adams, Edwin D. Mead, and myself as chairman, to represent the Society before the Transit Commissioners in regard to certain proposed changes in the west end of the Old State House in connection with the Washington Street subway. After some informal and unofficial communication with Governor Guild, I found that, owing to the great popular opposition in the matter, no change would be made in the building; and for that reason the Committee were not called together. I report the fact now in order that they may be discharged.

I have received from Mr. Charles E. Goodspeed, the publisher, a copy of an early print entitled "A Prospect of the Colledges in Cambridge in New England," which was made in the year

1726, and dedicated to William Dummer, at that time Acting Governor. It has been re-engraved on copper by Sidney L. Smith, from the original in the possession of the Historical Society, which is supposed to be unique. This impression is number four of an edition of seventy-five only, and the plate destroyed.

Mr. CHARLES C. SMITH said:—

Our late associate the Hon. George F. Hoar once said: "The greatest penalty of growing old is the loss of the friends of youth." The remark is not only true as a generalization, but it is especially true with regard to a body of limited membership like this Society. Not only do the friends whom a member knew when he came into it drop by the way; but the new friends whom he comes to know intimately and to work with too often pass from sight, leaving a new void. Of the five officers who have seats at this table two Presidents, three Recording Secretaries, besides four Secretaries *pro tempore*,<sup>1</sup> and two Corresponding Secretaries, have died since I became Treasurer. With all of these I was brought into very intimate relations; but with no one did I have so long an official connection as with Dr. Young. For more than twenty-two years we sat side by side here. We were together on the committees for publishing fifteen volumes of Proceedings and one volume of Collections, and we were members of at least two special committees, in both of which he did useful service. Our associations were too close and too long continued, and I valued his friendship too much, to permit me to remain silent to-day.

It would be little to say that our relations were uniformly agreeable, for Dr. Young had many lovable qualities; our tastes and opinions in general were much alike, and we were naturally inclined to look at questions from similar points of view. Sometimes, indeed, I thought that Dr. Young was not sufficiently outspoken and tenacious in the maintenance of the views which we both held. He was always unassuming, courteous, and conciliatory, but perhaps somewhat over-sensitive. He was in fact a little annoyed when, as seldom happened, some one asked to have the record corrected, or his own name

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Deane, who returned to this side of the table for a few months after the death of Mr. Quincy, Rev. Henry W. Foote, Rev. Edward G. Porter, and Mr. Clement H. Hill.

added to the list of members present at a previous meeting. For this omission Dr. Young was in no way responsible, as it had been the practice from time immemorial for the Treasurer to assist the Secretary by checking off the list of members present. It is probably known to not more than one or two here that eight years ago, when Mr. McCleary resigned the office of Cabinet-Keeper after five years of devoted service, Dr. Young also purposed to retire; but he yielded to my personal urgency and withheld the letter to the Nominating Committee which he had prepared. I am sure that neither he nor any of his associates ever regretted that he did not carry out his first intentions.

The eldest son of a sound and ripe scholar whose name will be forever associated with the earliest colonial history of Plymouth and Massachusetts, and who for nearly nineteen years was an honored member of this Society, our late Recording Secretary brought to a congenial task the same high qualifications which characterized the father. Of him it was said at his death: "His strongest characteristic was faithfulness. He slighted nothing which he undertook. He performed nothing in a perfunctory manner." This was not less true of the son. With an active and retentive memory, in no way impaired until a few months before his death, prompt in doing whatever he had to do, and always in his seat, he was, as has been justly said, "a model Secretary." He loved his work, and he did it well. Exact and methodical in his habits, he was an excellent reporter of what was said and done here or at the Council board, and a careful and judicious critic of the communications which came under his eye. He had withal a lively sense of humor which often found expression in some apt quotation or some playful and suggestive remark.

In the earlier years of his membership he made several noteworthy contributions to the Proceedings, of which the most elaborate were his paper on the subjects for the Master's degree at Harvard College between 1655 and 1791, and an admirable tribute to Professor Diman, a Corresponding Member, his fellow student in Germany and a cherished friend in later years. But after his election to the Secretaryship his contributions became infrequent, and were usually limited to a few words or sentences. The most important was the me-

moir of our associate Rev. Dr. Andrew P. Peabody. As a writer his style was clear, compact, and forceful, with little attempt at ornament, but showing marks of a wide reading of the best authors. His services to us were rather in the line of a self-effacing discharge of official duty than by oral statements or by written papers to enliven our meetings and to be printed in the Proceedings.

In what has now been said I have purposely limited myself to the life and work of Dr. Young in his relations to this Society, that I might not encroach on the field of the biographer. It will be for the friend and associate who will be appointed to prepare the customary memoir for the Proceedings to take a larger view. To him will be the pleasant duty of describing what Dr. Young did in the churches to which he was a faithful minister, in the College, and in other societies and associations of which he was an influential and valued member; of giving a just estimate of his printed sermons, addresses, and essays, and of portraying in adequate words the personal character which endeared our late associate to all who knew him well. All that will come later, and from another hand. Only a word need be added now to this imperfect tribute.

Passing from the Boston Latin School to Harvard College and the Divinity School, he spent some time in study in Germany, not then so much a place of resort for young Americans just out of college as it has since become; after that lengthened period of preparation a successful ministry of twelve years at Newton; a professorship of eleven years at Cambridge; a ministry of twelve years at Waltham; a second visit to Europe, three years ago, when he spent most of his time in Holland, Switzerland, and Southern Germany, countries which he then saw for the first time; a trip to Alaska; and some shorter excursions;—these, with the family sorrows which come to almost every one in the journey of life, and which he felt very keenly, make up the sum, the abstract, of an uneventful but active and fruitful life, extended to more than seventy-seven years. He will be greatly missed here and in the editorial room. In both he has

“left

Deposited upon the silent shore  
Of memory, images and precious thoughts  
That shall not die, and cannot be destroyed.”

Mr. HENRY W. HAYNES said : —

We miss, upon our return to-day, the genial, benignant countenance of the oldest, in years, of our number, and one of the most constant in his attendance here. Rev. Dr. Edmund F. Slafter died on the 22d of last month, at the age of ninety, at Little Boar's Head, in North Hampton, New Hampshire, where for several years past he has made his summer home amid a circle of congenial friends.

“ Of no distemper, of no blast he died,  
But fell like autumn fruit that mellowed long, —  
Even wondered at, because he dropped no sooner.”

He had been a member of this Society for just a quarter of a century, having been elected at the October meeting, 1881. From the first he has been a frequent contributor to our Proceedings, and participant in our discussions; he has served upon the Council from 1894 to 1896, and in the latter year prepared its annual report. He also served upon various committees, and to him we owe the valuable suggestion of the blank form used for the personal record of members. This is not the occasion for an enumeration of his many valuable writings, but it seems only proper to call attention to such of them as are to be found in our own Proceedings. The first volume of the second series contains a memoir of our late associate Charles W. Tuttle; and the second, one of Rev. William S. Bartlet. In the fourth volume there is an elaborate paper, involving much careful research, on “Royal Memorials and Emblems in Use in the Colonies before the Revolution.” To the eighth volume he contributed a memoir of our late Cabinet-Keeper, Dr. Fitch Edward Oliver. On the occasion of the death of Dr. Samuel Eliot he paid a tribute to his memory, to be found in the twelfth volume. There is a short paper on “Coat Armor” in the fourteenth; a tribute to the memory of Robert Noxon Tappan in the fifteenth, and to that of William S. Appleton in the seventeenth volumes respectively. A brief paper on “The Landing of the Hessians” can be found in the eighteenth. His last contribution was a learned study of “The Book of Sports,” read so recently as last February, and contained in the nineteenth volume.

I will merely attempt at this time to give the briefest possible outline of his long, faithful, and useful services in our

community. He was born in Norwich, Vermont, May 30, 1816; fitted for college at Thetford Academy, and graduated from Dartmouth College in 1840. His *alma mater* fifty years later, in 1890, bestowed upon him the honorary degree of Doctor of Divinity. After teaching in the Thetford and Topsfield Academies, he pursued his studies in divinity at Andover Theological Seminary, from which he graduated in 1844. In July of the same year he was ordained deacon in the Protestant Episcopal Church, and priest in the following July. His successive parishes were St. Peter's Church, Cambridgeport, 1844-1846; St. John's Church, Jamaica Plain, 1846-1853; and from 1853 to 1857 he was assistant rector of St. Paul's Church, Boston. His most conspicuous service, however, was as Agent of the American Bible Society for many years from 1857, during which he presented the activities and needs of his society before the congregations of his denomination. Up to the time of his death he was a Trustee and Corresponding Secretary of the Massachusetts Bible Society, and Chairman of the Executive Committee. From 1884 until his death he was Registrar of the Episcopal Diocese of Massachusetts. For twenty years, 1867 to 1887, he was connected with the New England Historic Genealogical Society, as Corresponding Secretary; from 1874 to 1889 a Director, and member of the Committee on Publications from 1879 to 1889. His most important literary and historical work, however, was done for the Prince Society, of which he was Recording Secretary, 1865, 1866; Vice-President, 1866-1880; and President, 1880-1895. Seven volumes of its publications were edited by him; they were "Sir William Alexander and American Colonization," 1873; "Voyage of the Northmen to America," 1877; "Voyages of Samuel de Champlain," three volumes, 1880-1882; "John Checkley; or the Evolution of Religious Toleration in Massachusetts Bay," two volumes, 1897.

By the gentleness and cheerfulness of his daily life, by the steadfastness of his friendship, by faithfulness to every duty, he was a living example of the truths he preached, and he leaves a memory that will "smell sweet and blossom in the dust."

Rev. Dr. JAMES DE NORMANDIE was appointed to write the memoir of Rev. Dr. Young.



The following vote proposed by the Council was adopted :

*Voted*, That the nominations upon the Nomination Book heretofore in use be referred to a committee, to be appointed by the President, which shall have power to reserve from entry in the new book the names of all persons whom their sponsors, upon being consulted, do not wish to press for election.

The President subsequently appointed Messrs. Charles F. Adams, Wendell, and Stanwood as the Committee.

JAMES SCHOULER, LL.D., a Corresponding Member, read the following paper : —

*President Johnson's Papers*

In two articles lately published,<sup>1</sup> I set forth some of the new historical material brought to light in the valuable collection of President Andrew Johnson's papers which the Library of Congress had recently procured, confining myself, however, to the first and crucial year of his stormy administration. In the present paper I mean to present some results gathered from a full study of that collection.

While going over those manuscripts, which cover mainly a presidential term, one is sadly impressed by the fickleness of political courtiers under a government like ours. During Johnson's first year of supreme station, and while the policy for which he so eagerly worked remained for popular submission, letters came to him from every part of the land; but after the elections in the fall of 1866 made it clear that he had lost irretrievably his domination in affairs, correspondents dropped off and the variety of counsellors ceased. Other framers of a policy for the South were waited on; other planets rose in the horizon surrounded by their satellites. And whether one pitied or not the Tennessean's misfortune, now that he was brought to bay, most prudent aspirants in politics, regardless of their own future, were heedful that specimens of their handwriting should not get into the White House portfolio, to be produced later, perchance, to their prejudice. The wave of executive popularity subsided, and with it

<sup>1</sup> "President Johnson and Negro Suffrage," *Outlook*, January 13, 1906; "President Johnson's Policy," *Outlook*, February 3, 1906.

the freight of miscellaneous correspondence, at first so huge. But two sorts of letters from the people came occasionally through the mail, — one, brutal and threatening, from some anonymous blackguard, who signed himself (fictitiously, perhaps) a Union soldier; the other, from some superannuated voter, who dreamed of Jackson, and exhorted the new Andrew to defy Congress and make confusion worse.

Two-thirds of both Houses at Washington were already united against Andrew Johnson, and, leaving Southern States still unrepresented, such was the assured condition of things for the remainder of this administration. Already, in the excited canvass of 1866, had a project been started for impeaching the obstinate Executive, and replacing him by Wade, of Ohio, President *pro tem.* of the Senate. Benjamin F. Butler, of Massachusetts, who now emerged from retirement in Lowell to run for Congress in a neighboring district as a full-fledged party Republican, pressed such a plan in campaign speeches through New York and Ohio. The President took cognizance of such assaults upon him and procured minutes of Butler's faulty record from the files of the War Department. Once — and once only, it would seem — had the two men held a personal correspondence, and that was during the first month after Johnson's accession to the Presidency, when Butler seems to have proposed that General Lee should be arrested and placed upon trial for treason.<sup>1</sup> Wendell Phillips was another strenuous pleader for Johnson's impeachment, and he proposed that the President should be "sequestered" from office while the impeachment trial went on. Cameron, too, who now re-entered Congress as a Senator of Pennsylvania, had pledged himself to an impeachment policy.

The President had injured himself and his cause immensely in that canvass by his violent harangues upon the stump, assailing the motives of his opponents in Congress, and "swinging round the circle" to advocate "my policy." Defeat at the polls, however, sobered and steadied him, and he followed fairly the advice which now came to him from friendly sources,

<sup>1</sup> See General Butler's long letter, April 25, 1865, written while at Washington, which argued that the effect of Lee's capitulation upon the individuals concerned therein, applied only while they were "prisoners of war"; a condition which ended (so he claimed), together with all stipulated immunity from arrest, when the Civil War ceased. (Johnson MSS.)

not to try to stem the tide, but to yield, and use silently to the advantage of the country such opportunities as he might find later. Hence his opening message to Congress, in December, 1866, was unexpectedly calm, dignified, and dispassionate in tone. He still claimed stubbornly that his reconstruction plan was on principle the right one, but pugnacity he laid aside.

Impeachment discussion was strong this winter (1866-1867), while Congress held its short and final session, and an inquiry was instituted in the House of Representatives. Nothing appeared upon which to found such procedure, except, perhaps, that defamation of Congress before the people which was made a definite charge a year later. A vile slander had circulated to the effect that Johnson was implicated in President Lincoln's assassination, but this received its quietus.

Johnson's discreet silence under the new provocation of his radical assailants called forth the sympathy of some eminent men identified in their day with this Society. Charles Francis Adams, still minister at London, wrote home at this time a private letter which highly praised the President's opening message and the sound financial views expressed in Secretary McCulloch's report. Robert C. Winthrop, in a friendly epistle to the President himself, reported that a clique of gold speculators were said to have raised a fund of \$50,000 for promoting impeachment in the House of Representatives. Rev. Dr. Chandler Robbins, confiding in the President's patriotic intentions, but regretting the intemperate language he had used on his Western tour, advised confidentially the publication of a letter to some friend which should apologize for the tone of his excited utterances while avowing his real sincerity of motive. These and other like tokens of good-will from men of standing the President preserved among his papers.

But in the course of the ensuing summer (1867), and while the new Congress, now fully organized, had adjourned its session, an antagonism between the President and his Secretary of War hastened to a climax. Johnson's papers show that when, in March, 1865, he resigned the military governorship of Tennessee to be sworn in as Vice-President, friendly courtesies were interchanged, Secretary Stanton commending in the warmest terms the war services Johnson had rendered. Together with his colleagues, in fact, Stanton sustained Presi-

dent Lincoln's generous policy towards the South, while the latter was alive; but soon after Lincoln's death he joined Sumner and Stevens in their dissent and came into close co-operation with the congressional majority, while holding tenaciously his place in the cabinet. The anomaly was thus presented of a virtual obstructor of the Chief Executive, and not an adviser and subordinate, such as our Constitution alone recognizes in such relation. This course detached Stanton from his colleagues in the cabinet and alienated him more and more from the President, whom he nominally served. In earlier episodes of politics our great War Secretary had shown the same disregard of the proprieties of life and of those honorable feelings which lead a man to resign his post and withdraw where self-respect forbids a faithful service. The justification put forward for conduct so singular has been an overwhelming sense of duty to the people, to country; and of the measure of that justification, whether in 1861 or 1867, posterity must judge. Retaining office at the present time to thwart and overrule his commander-in-chief was Stanton's recognized task from the radicals, and he shrank neither from the odium nor the treachery of such a course.

Congress had originated and proposed the Fourteenth Amendment, and States lately rebellious had most unwisely held back from acceding to it; and now came the reconstruction act of March 2, 1867, under which military generals were to assume command by geographical departments. A cabinet council was held in June to consider this act, and all except Stanton acceded to the idea that the President could still exert his constitutional discretion. Stanton, however, maintained, boldly and bluntly, that Congress meant here to establish military governments at the South to suit its own views as against the President, and that it had the power to do so.<sup>1</sup> There was at this time much ill-feeling in Louisiana, with riotous commotion at New Orleans; and General Sheridan, in command there, was accused of political favoritism. The situation called for a military change and new military orders. Stanton's course was exasperating; so, after vainly asking his

<sup>1</sup> These "cabinet proceedings" are among the Johnson papers. But they were published contemporaneously in the press, as the *Annual Cyclopædia* shows.

resignation, the President displaced him and appointed General Grant in his place.

This displacement, which took effect in the recess of Congress, was not in strict law a removal, but rather a suspension from office, so that General Grant succeeded as Secretary of War *ad interim*. For Congress had, March 2, passed, over the President's veto, a "tenure of office" act which, took from the President all right to remove incumbents absolutely without the consent of the Senate. This legislation, which, as to cabinet advisers at least, may justly be deemed unconstitutional, was expressly meant to place a muzzle upon this administration, and make Congress, or rather the Senate, supreme. When the Houses met in December, the President sent to the Senate his reasons for Stanton's suspension, as the statute directed; but he had intended, in case the Senate voted adversely, to oppose in the courts upon fundamental grounds the return of that obnoxious Secretary.<sup>1</sup>

The victorious North, through the present turmoil between President and Congress, relied upon its general in chief, as another Washington, to control the situation, and to pacify and reunite the country; and Grant's great reticence, added to his transcendent military renown, won him popular confidence. But his *ad interim* tenure here involved him in a dilemma. The Senate in its present unyielding mood disapproved, as might have been expected, the suspension of its own co-operator in the cabinet; whereupon, January 13, 1868, Stanton at once reappeared at the War Department to resume his official status. General Grant yielded up the keys immediately, and then notified the President that he had done so. While Stanton fortified his repossession of headquarters, there to remain, day and night, an angry correspondence ensued between the President and General Grant, over the General's precipitate retirement from his post, as though to outwit the Chief Executive in forcing Stanton into court to test his reinstatement. Andrew Johnson claimed — and in this his whole cabinet corroborated his statement — that Grant had clearly understood such a purpose on the President's part, and

<sup>1</sup> Meanwhile the President had compelled his Secretary *ad interim* to detail General Hancock to the military command of Louisiana and send Sheridan elsewhere. Grant had protested earnestly on his friend's behalf, but yielded obedience.

had given his consent, so far at least as to allow another *ad interim* appointment to be seasonably made, should he himself prefer to stand aside.

This correspondence, which is preserved in the Library of Congress, shows the amended drafts of letters which came from the President himself. The correspondence itself came out at once in the press and was republished in the Annual Cyclopædia; but a perusal of manuscripts may interest those of our day who are curious to gather how far the executive—a self-taught man of humble antecedents, as all admit—relied upon the composition of others. My friend and fellow Corresponding Member, Professor Dunning, has shown from comparison of drafts that President Johnson's first message to Congress was substantially the work of the historian Bancroft.<sup>1</sup> But Bancroft left America, early in 1867, to be minister to Prussia; and yet President Johnson's messages and state papers continued to show strength and dignity through a four years' term replete with controversy. In the present correspondence with General Grant we see him pressing his adversary closely and with forceful ability. It is only in those maundering speeches which cost him and his supporters so heavily at the polls in 1866, that the President seems really vulgar and ridiculous. Probably, while he called upon others to aid him in his public compositions, he had trained himself into a strong and effective penman for political discussion. His career, we should remember, had been long and eminent prior to that momentous year which saw him associate and then successor of Abraham Lincoln. He was a Senator of the United States before the Civil War; both as civil and as military governor he had held positions foremost in his native State of Tennessee. His public career, advancing from grade to grade, was long and remarkable before casualty exalted him to be head of the nation. But of Johnson it may perhaps be said, as one has said of General Hooker, that there were in him two distinct persons. The one proud, dignified, statesmanlike in action or utterance, displayed the man of public experience in mature life, while he kept fully

<sup>1</sup> 2 Proceedings, vol. xix. p. 395. See American Historical Review, vol. xi. p. 951, with its references, favoring the idea that Mr. Bancroft, instead of composing the President's message for him, worked into literary shape materials which Johnson himself supplied.

his self-control; the other, and the more intimate, disclosed him as boastful and loquacious over his remarkable rise in life, as a self-made man, vulgar still, worshipful of his maker. But self-controlled or not, Johnson was vehement of purpose, wilful to the point of obstinacy when opposed, and while passionately devoted to the Union itself, like others in Tennessee whom the greater Andrew had inspired, he was yet a Southern man in instincts and associations, and felt, beyond all possible experiment to elevate the negro, compassion for his prostrate white brethren, so many of whom, once disdainful of him in patrician pride, now sought him submissively for peace and pardon. Johnson in public life was an honest man; and when he became President he refused the Northern gift of a coach and equipage, lest he should be placed under obligations officially to the givers. He continued upright in politics and patriotic; not all the blandishments brought to bear upon him could persuade him to Tylerize or to bestow his patronage so as to strengthen the opposition party of 1864, which could now freely reorganize. Union men, such as Lincoln himself might have selected, composed his cabinet and filled the other national offices to the end of his term; "copperheads" made no headway with him.

The impeachment and trial of President Johnson are matters of history. The President's new effort, in February, 1868, to displace Stanton, by bringing Adjutant-General Thomas into charge of the War Department *ad interim*, was promptly followed by an impeachment, which the House based mainly upon his assumed violation of the tenure of office act; judicial ruling upon the constitutionality of that act, however, having been forefended. Among the Johnson papers may be seen the draft of the President's answer as filed in the trial pleadings before the Senate. Upon the momentous question whether, pending an impeachment trial, a President can be rightfully suspended from office by act of Congress, and a president *pro tem.* of the Senate put in his place, the President, in November, 1867, consulted his cabinet. What answers, if any, were made, I do not discover; but Congress wisely chose to undertake no such revolutionary experiment, as some of the radicals had advised; and certainly any attempt thus to sequester the presidential office, especially where the people had no successor of their own choice at

hand, must have been perilous. It would have meant that a vindictive congressional faction may at any time, by merely instituting an impeachment and keeping the trial postponed, hold the Chief Magistracy of the nation in their own hands.

After the House had passed its resolution, we see the President following the written advice given him by Senator Reverdy Johnson, to employ counsel of imperturbable temper, conciliating tongue, and able minds. He himself remained outwardly calm, awaiting the result. He did not, as some partisans counselled him, respond to a Senate with unrepresented States by denying its jurisdiction, issuing a proclamation to the people, and then resigning, as though to forestall a decision which must have disqualified him from holding any office thenceforth. And had he taken such a course, might not Congress have put itself on record as refusing to accept his resignation and proceeding by its own methods? Yet, so strongly had the dominating wing of the Senate held its party together that, notwithstanding a few exceptional Republicans were known to have stood out from their colleagues wholly on the present issue, a two-thirds vote against the President seemed assured and would actually have been given, had not one unknown member of that body, from Kansas, recorded a negative unexpectedly against his party when the poll was taken. That Senator, Ross by name, driven into political retirement on the first opportunity, as though with the brand of Cain upon his forehead, died not many months ago in utter poverty and obscurity; and yet posterity should be grateful to him for what he prevented.

The test vote at the trial came upon the count which arraigned Andrew Johnson for abusing Congress in his speeches to the people. This failing, a vote was later taken, and with the same result, upon his alleged disregard of the civil tenure act in attempting to oust Stanton from his cabinet by the Thomas *ad interim* appointment. Following this new failure in the senatorial court, Stanton now resigned of his own accord, and General Schofield became his unopposed successor in the War Department for the rest of this administration. At the Republican convention held May, 1868, in Chicago, General Grant was nominated President; and such was the universal trust reposed in him in that crisis that the people would have chosen him, against all other candidates, whether



indorsed by one national party or another, or without a party indorsement at all. For the real platform of this campaign, which pleased both North and South, was expressed in Grant's own letter of acceptance, "Let us have peace." And, following his election, our military President pressed Congress, first of all, to repeal the civil tenure act; and it did so presently, as though to concede upon reflection that the statute constraints against which Grant's predecessor had struggled and had, in consequence, so nearly been expelled from office, were indeed unconstitutional.

I have shown in a former paper<sup>1</sup> how the reactionary foes of Republicanism had tried to get Seward expelled from the cabinet, in company with Stanton, and how persistently President Johnson disregarded that advice. Whatever his own party foes might have said against our astute Secretary of State, disloyalty to his chief or an ignoble clinging to office was not among the faults to be imputed to him. When, under Abraham Lincoln, a senatorial committee waited upon the President to have Seward sacrificed, the Secretary tendered at once his resignation and enabled his chief fully to control the situation. And this Johnson collection brings newly to light a letter written in Seward's own hand, August 23, 1867, which tendered his resignation once more to Lincoln's successor, in terms of cordial expression. Needless to say, that resignation was not accepted; and promptly at midday, May 16, 1868, after impeachment had failed in the Senate, we see the Secretary of State despatching a note to the White House which congratulated the President on the day's result. Seward exalted this administration and himself by three notable achievements of diplomacy: (1) in bringing French intervention to a close in Mexico and compelling Louis Napoleon to withdraw his troops, while keeping public intercourse with France unruffled; (2) in acquiring Alaska from Russia by friendly cession; (3) in procuring that Johnson-Clarendon treaty with Great Britain which, though rejected in the Senate, made the entering wedge of indemnity, as later arranged under President Grant, for the Alabama spoliation. Political mischief-makers during Johnson's term turned their later assaults rather upon McCulloch, the Secretary of the Treasury, charging him with

<sup>1</sup> Outlook, February 3, 1906.

a cunning duplicity towards the President in his use of the patronage. Such charges McCulloch denounced as false; and he, too, strengthened an administration by no means popular, through his zealous devotion to business. Attorney-General Stanbery, who bore his own rejection by a resentful Senate, wrote the President in July, 1868, doubtless with wisdom and truthfully: "the present cabinet has served you faithfully, and no advantage is apparent for a change."

Johnson's administration came to a tranquil close; and well did he claim, upon retiring, that, like the Hebrew prophet, he had robbed and defrauded no one. His wilful and inflexible temper, his adherence to plans impossible of execution, did harm to himself and his supporters, as well as to those Southern fellow-citizens whom he had meant to succor. Posterity admits that the country could never have given willingly to an accidental successor the same free hand in reconstruction that it meant to allow to Abraham Lincoln; and so, too, that under all circumstances Congress must have had the last word in such a policy. But Johnson meant right, and, to a considerable extent, was right in the course he pursued.

Though too honorable to court a nomination from opposition Democrats, Andrew Johnson would doubtless have liked a vindication of some kind from the people. But it was utterly impossible that he or any other candidate could in 1868 have defeated General Grant, who stood strongest with the people because he had no record at all except a consummate military one. This fact the national Democracy, in 1868, seemed to apprehend. Pendleton was the favorite of the reactionaries, but their convention lurched over to ex-Governor Seymour, not hoping seriously to choose him President, but seeking to make sure of the great Northern State of New York with its local patronage. President Johnson left the White House, in March, 1869, and returned to his native State. When, a few months later, at the State election, Tennessee threw off radicalism and went conservative, this whole country was startled by the likelihood that her legislature would send Andrew Johnson back to Washington to sit at once among the Senators who had voted for impeachment, and renew, if he liked, his issue of veracity with the whilom *ad interim* Secretary of War, now installed at the White House. Strong pressure was brought upon Tennessee to avert such a

situation ; and by “an infamous combination,” as his personal friends styled it, Johnson was defeated in the legislature by a majority of two and a neutral went to Washington in his stead. But the ex-President regained steadily his hold upon the State he had served so long and intimately. His opportunity returned, and Tennessee’s legislature, in January, 1875, chose him to the United States Senate, — the only instance hitherto in our annals in which an ex-President has gained such a call from retirement. But the honor came too late ; Johnson’s sands of life were nearly run out ; and though sworn in, at Washington, to take his seat for a brief extra session, he died during the recess of that summer, July 30, 1875, shortly after returning home.

Mr. EDWARD STANWOOD read the first part of a paper which is not yet finished, on the “Movement for the Separation of Maine from Massachusetts,” which began in 1784 and ended in 1792. The paper when completed will be printed in the Proceedings.

A new serial of the Proceedings, comprising the record of the May and June meetings, was ready at this meeting.